

MA Attribute Public Review  
Ecological Attributes

November 6, 2007

Organization	Comment	Attribute #	DNR Response
Anglers of the Ausable	Have no significant problem with them at this time	ALL	Support acknowledged
Forestland Group	Wildlife species distribution patterns as defined in the WAP. What are the select species?	4	Not all species distribution patterns are adequately known, so the attribute refers to only those species where such data are available.
ARC Consulting Services	Add endangered, threatened and sensitive species.	New	Consideration of threatened and endangered species was added to Ecological attribute #4.
ARC Consulting Services	Add wetlands and aquatic systems.	New	Wetlands and aquatic systems are already addressed as part of Ecological attributes 1, 5 and 7.
Ruffed Grouse Society	Suggest management selection criteria include adequate amounts of young forest habitat.	New	Early successional habitat is addressed through Ecological attribute # 3.
Little Manistee Watershed Conservation Council	Would like to see provisions that would protect various watersheds.	New	Consideration of watersheds was added to Ecological attribute # 7.
Unaffiliated Comment	I feel that it is good to be aware of remnant historic vegetation sites and to manage for their continuance. I do not favor trying to restore vegetative cover types to historic levels.	2	Support acknowledged

Organization	Comment	Attribute #	DNR Response
Unaffiliated Comment	I believe that current vegetation is to a large degree the result of "recent" past practices. This does not imply that current vegetation is necessarily the "best" cover type for a particular site. I believe that managers need to be cognizant of site potential, future expected market opportunities and non-timber use requirements when planning for a future desired condition of a stand. I feel that managers need to be thinking about the effect climate change may have in the next 50-100 + years on site potential.	3	Comment acknowledged
Unaffiliated Comment	I do not favor managing too extensive of areas for single select wildlife species. I prefer that management be directed more towards guilds.	4	Comment acknowledged
Unaffiliated Comment	I prefer that buffers, i.e. no management zones, be extremely limited in size and number. I prefer that ecologically sensitive sites be referred to as special (named) management zones wherein the management scheme is directed toward the needs of the specific sensitive community.	5	Comment acknowledged
The Nature Conservancy	We fully support the various ecological criteria. Especially the inclusion of historical conditions.	ALL	Support acknowledged
The Nature Conservancy	There are no criteria that specifically address aquatic features.	New	Consideration of watersheds was added to Ecological attribute # 7. Aquatic habitats are also addressed as part of Ecological attribute #1.

Organization	Comment	Attribute #	DNR Response
MI Forest Products Council	Using site potential and habitat type is generally a good practice for managing healthy sustainable forests; however, we are concerned that this analysis could result in large-scale forest cover type change across the state forest system. The Department should examine a variety of local and regional issues, including market dependency before making large-scale cover type changes based on site potential.	1	Support acknowledged
MI Forest Products Council	The consideration of historic vegetative composition is somewhat troubling in the context of what should be a forward-looking management plan. Comparing present-day and circa-1800 relative abundances of tree species in proposed management areas does not seem to relate to forest management strategies consistent with managing for the future. the Department should explain how management for past conditions, in the midst of a forest ecosystem that is largely the result of decades of disturbance will ensure sustainable forest management into the future.	2	Comment acknowledged
MI Forest Products Council	We are supportive of using current vegetative composition and structure as a criterion in developing regional plans	3	Support acknowledged
MI Forest Products Council	We are unsure how the Department will use the criterion "proximity to known ecologically sensitive sites."	5	Comment acknowledged
MI Forest Products Council	Not enough information is provided in the regional management planning process to provide comment on the remaining three ecological criteria	4, 6, 7	Comment acknowledged

Organization	Comment	Attribute #	DNR Repsonse
Michigan Assoc of Timbermen	We feel that it is good to be aware of remnant historic vegetation sites and to manage for their continuance. We do not favor trying to restore vegetative cover types to historic levels.	2	Comment acknowledged
Michigan Assoc of Timbermen	Current vegetation is the result of past management and harvesting practices. This does not imply that current vegetation is necessarily the "best" cover type for a particular site. When planning for a future desired condition of a stand the proposed management plans need to take into account site potential, future expected market opportunities and non-timber use requirements.	3	Comment acknowledged
Michigan Assoc of Timbermen	We do not agree with the manipulation of forest types to manage for a selected species when the site is not well suited for the selected species timber type.	4	Comment acknowledged
Michigan Assoc of Timbermen	I prefer that buffers, i.e. no management zones, be extremely limited in size and number. I prefer that ecologically sensitive sites be referred to as special (named) management zones wherein the management scheme is directed toward the needs of the specific sensitive community.	5	Comment acknowledged
Unaffiliated Comment	Managing timber should not be considered as breaking up connectivity or as fragmentation.	6	Comment acknowledged
Unaffiliated Comment	I have concerns that the criteria maybe used as a back door approach to set asides.	5	Comment acknowledged